

MAR 02 2005 14:47 FROM: HOUSTON IP GROUP

2815148332

TO:

P.003/004



**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR §1.8**  
I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted on the date indicated below via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, facsimile number (703) 746-4000.

Date

3.2.2005

Carrie McDerby

**PATENT**  
**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the application of:	) Confirmation: 9998
Jeffrey P. Lee	)
Serial Number: 09/311,254	) Art Unit: 2178
Filing Date: 5/12/1999	) Examiner: Paula, Cesar B.
Title: SEGMENTING A DOCUMENT INTO REGIONS ASSOCIATED WITH A DATA TYPE, AND ASSIGNING PIPELINES TO PROCESS SUCH REGIONS	) Docket No.: 10990419-5

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENTS OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In regard to the Reasons for Allowance accompanying the Notice of Allowance and Fees Due mailed on December 23, 2004, Applicant submits the following Comments. In particular, in the Examiner's reasons for allowance, the Examiner states:

"Regarding claims 1, 7, and 13, the Examiner concurs with the applicant's statement that "Ulead merely discusses a processing system in which all of the regions of a particular document are processed. Ulead does not show or suggest the concept of processing only regions that comprise a selected data type. The post processing options described on page 165 in Ulead are automatically applied to the entire image or document without regard for any selected regions by a user. In this respect, Ulead teaches away from selecting the specific regions types for processing given that the entire document is processed each time. In addition, given that Ulead teaches processing an entire document, Applicant asserts that Ulead teaches away from

Serial Number: 09/311,254Docket Number: 10990419-5

the combination with Mahoney which describes a searching function based upon document type."

Furthermore, the subject matter discussed in claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, and 17-24 above are not shown nor would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made in the prior art cited."

While Applicant concurs that the art of record does not show or suggest the elements of the claims recited above in the Examiner's reasons for allowance and that the various references teach away from the combination of references noted, Applicant notes that the claims also recite other elements that are not shown or suggested in the art of record. Applicant asserts that the present claims are allowable for at least the reason that the art of record does not show or suggest all of the recited elements of the claims. Thus, Applicant asserts that each claim is allowable in view of the complete language recited therein, as well as equivalents. Applicants respectfully assert that the scope of each claim as allowed is to be determined from the actual claim language, including all equivalents.

Respectfully Submitted,



Philip S. Lyren  
Reg. No. 40,709